

## TSE-0020 (contd); TSE-0021

**1**

1 man, as it were. And I just want, I have a  
2 very brief comment to follow up on the  
3 physicians that were up here representing WPSR,  
4 which that it is unwise, unfair, and  
5 unacceptable for the DOE to ask the citizens of  
6 Washington or Oregon to assume the additional  
7 health risks that will come with additional  
8 wastes imported to Hanford. That's my  
9 statement.

10 But, I am not quite done. I also  
11 have a friend who regrettably could not be here  
12 this evening. He is a citizen, a taxpayer, a  
13 voter, and a friend of mine, and he asked me to  
14 read his statement to the DOE, which I also  
15 delivered to Yvonne in writing. And this is  
16 from Dane Spencer, and he lives on Bainbridge  
17 Island.

**TSE-0021**  
**See**  
**L-0020**

18 Statement to the Department of  
19 Energy.

20 Let me see if I have this right. I  
21 am a little confused about all this nuclear  
22 waste and I want to see if it makes sense to  
23 you, because it doesn't make sense to me.

24 In 1945 U.S. citizens paid taxes for  
25 the Manhattan Project, a project we knew

72

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0021 (contd)

**See  
L-0020**

1 nothing about, that resulted in producing  
2 nuclear waste, as well as the two bombs that  
3 were dropped on Japan.

4 Less than one year after the bombing  
5 of Japan we created and detonated another  
6 atomic bomb that continued to spread fallout,  
7 spending U.S. citizens taxpayer money, again  
8 without our knowledge or permission.

9 The Atomic Energy Commission, which  
10 is now the Department of Energy, continued to  
11 create and detonate atomic bombs, spending U.S.  
12 citizen taxpayer money, again without our  
13 knowledge, continuing to contaminate every man,  
14 woman and child in the United States, and parts  
15 of Canada and Mexico, with fallout, while  
16 accumulating large amounts of radioactive waste  
17 in various parts of this country.

18 The AEC/Department of Energy, in  
19 fact, from 1945 to 1962 detonated over 1,000  
20 atomic and nuclear bombs, many above ground,  
21 contributing to at least 20,000 deaths of U.S.  
22 citizens from thyroid cancer, according to  
23 figures released by the United States Centers  
24 for Disease Control.

25 In other words, the AEC/Department

73

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TSE-0021 (contd)

**See  
L-0020**

1 of Energy killed U.S. citizens using U.S.  
2 taxpayer money and did so ostensibly without  
3 our knowledge.

4 Additionally, the production of  
5 these atomic and nuclear weapons created huge  
6 amounts of nuclear waste that has never been  
7 cleaned up or taken care of.

8 The DOE wants to transport 70,000  
9 shipments of nuclear waste in a steady stream  
10 on our roads, railways, and shipping lanes, to  
11 the Hanford Nuclear Reservation with U.S.  
12 taxpayer money, mostly without our collective  
13 knowledge, and definitely without our  
14 permission. This steady stream of nuclear  
15 waste will be in transit on our highways and  
16 railways or several generations.

17 The DOE is using the legal system to  
18 leverage its enormous power against the  
19 democratically elected government of the State  
20 of Washington, with U.S. citizen taxpayer  
21 money, to slow down, no, to halt the U.S.  
22 taxpayer funded nuclear waste clean-up in the  
23 State of Washington, South Carolina, and Nevada  
24 just to name a few.

25 The DOE, with U.S. citizen taxpayer

74

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0021 (contd)

**See  
L-0020**

1 money, is threatening to sue the State of  
2 Washington, which will have to use U.S. citizen  
3 taxpayer money to legally defend itself from  
4 the DOE's lack of commitment to clean up the  
5 nuclear waste that the AEC/DOE created over the  
6 last 58 years.

7 The DOE wants to reinstate nuclear  
8 testing of nuclear bunker busters and mini  
9 nukes at the Nevada Test Site which will create  
10 more radioactive fallout across the country,  
11 and will continue to create nuclear waste that  
12 will need shipping somewhere, probably Hanford,  
13 funded with U.S. citizen taxpayer money, again  
14 without our permission.

15 The DOE has no intention of ever  
16 cleaning up Hanford, the Nevada Test Site,  
17 Rocky Flats, North Carolina, etc., etc., and in  
18 fact, wants to expand the production of nuclear  
19 waste through the continued production of  
20 nuclear bombs and nuclear reactors, funded with  
21 U.S. citizen taxpayer money, again ostensibly  
22 without our collective knowledge and without  
23 our permission.

24 For 58 years from 1945 to the  
25 present, the DOE has funded the manufacturing

75

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0021 (contd); TSE-0022

**See  
L-0020**

1 of radioactive nuclear waste with U.S. citizen  
2 taxpayer money, without our collective  
3 knowledge or our permission, and is responsible  
4 or past and future deaths of U.S. citizens  
5 resulting from radioactive contamination from  
6 its waste sites and its facilities.

7 No, I have looked at this every way  
8 I can and it still doesn't make sense.

9 This is outrageous. Take a look in  
10 the mirror and tell me what you see. Tell me  
11 that you're doing this for the good of the  
12 country.

13 I will settle for nothing less than  
14 the complete halt of the manufacturing of  
15 radioactive nuclear waste, and the immediate  
16 cleanup of the DOE's deplorable legacy DOE has  
17 left our children to contend with. The people  
18 of this country will not stand for this type of  
19 irresponsible behavior.

20 Sincerely, Dane Spencer.

21 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.

22 Tom Carpenter.

23 **TSE-0022** MR. TOM CARPENTER: My name is  
24 Tom Carpenter, and I am with Government  
25 Accountability Project. And I am here to speak

76

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0022 (contd)

1 in favor of bringing in 12 and a half  
2 million cubic --

3 Oh, wait. No. No. I am not in  
4 favor of it. But I got Michael going there for  
5 a second.

6 But we have been to a lot of these  
7 hearings together. I recognize a lot of the  
8 faces in the audience.

9 And, you know, we have heard a lot  
10 about these volumes tonight, 444 billion  
11 gallons of nuclear waste, contaminated liquids,  
12 already put into the ground at the Hanford Site  
13 over 45 years.

14 But, you know, what does that really  
15 mean? Well, if you stood next to the Columbia  
16 River and watched it flow by for five days,  
17 that's about how much water that is.

18 We just heard a scientist from  
19 Battelle describe that if you were to put that  
20 volume of liquid into tanker cars holding about  
21 20,000 gallons each that you see on the  
22 railway, and you were stopped waiting for that  
23 train to pass, it would be about 250,000 miles  
24 of tanker cars going by.

25 So, I mean, we are talking some

77

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TSE-0022 (contd)

1 major volumes here. It's not 450 billion  
2 gallons, and we are talking oceans of nuclear  
3 waste that have already contaminated the  
4 Hanford Site.

5 And the really tragic part about  
6 this is, it's really not even about volume.  
7 Because we are talking about materials in such  
8 tiny, tiny amounts that one pound of plutonium,  
9 for instance, evenly divided among the lungs of  
10 the people of the planet earth, would kill  
11 everybody. So.

12 Microscopic, miniscule quantities of  
13 some of this stuff, dangerous for thousands and  
14 thousands of years, and I don't think it's 30  
15 and 40 years, I think it's probably 3,000 years  
16 of a half-life for most of these radionuclides,  
17 it's a real threat.

18 And it's not enough. We've got to  
19 add more to it. We've got to bring in another  
20 70,000 truck loads. And there's something  
21 wrong with this picture.

22 Already the fish in the Columbia  
23 River are so poisonous that people eating these  
24 fish face a big risk of cancer. Tribal  
25 children in particular face, according to the

78

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0022 (contd)

2

1 EPA, a one in 50 chance of getting cancer from  
2 eating fish. That's generally in the Columbia  
3 River.

4 At Hanford, it is the most  
5 contaminated, chemically contaminated, of  
6 course radiologically contaminated fish in the  
7 Columbia River.

8 This isn't discussed in the EIS.  
9 Big surprise.

3

10 This is a national nuclear waste  
11 dump and it's going to become much more of one  
12 when the DOE gets through, because you have  
13 heard tonight that they have foreshortened  
14 comment, and in fact the Hanford Advisory Board  
15 has said we want another two weeks to be able  
16 to comment, because we legally cannot comment.  
17 I am a member of that board. The DOE said,  
18 nah, forget it.

19 So, look, the conversation at  
20 Hanford is over. Okay? They're not listening.  
21 None of the comments here tonight will be taken  
22 into account, it's not going to mean a damn  
23 thing. We have had lots and lots of these  
24 hearings.

25 So, folks here, I really urge you to



## TSE-0022 (contd); TSE-0023

1 go up to the tables up there, sign the forms,  
2 saying you're interested in helping to work on  
3 an initiative to ban nuclear waste from being  
4 brought into the Hanford site for this year,  
5 and the initiative process is being pulled  
6 together by Heart of America, and Government  
7 Accountability Project, and PSR and Sierra Club  
8 and others, who are interested in doing  
9 something about it, not just coming to hearings  
10 and talking about it.

11 I urge you all to get involved.  
12 There is litigation going on. There's things  
13 that mean something that is more than just  
14 sitting around talking to somebody who is not  
15 listening. So I urge you, get involved in some  
16 way, and let's do something about this.

17 MR. DEE WILLIS: Frank Zucker.

18 **TSE-0023** MR. FRANK ZUCKER: My name is  
19 Frank Zucker.

20 And I agree with most of the  
21 comments that I have heard here tonight. In  
22 fact all of them, as far as I can tell.

23 So I am just going to add a small  
24 part. Clean water is a scarce resource. It is  
25 even scarcer than oil, according to some

80

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0023 (contd); TSE-0024

1 reports from national agencies. Water, not  
2 oil, is what we will be fighting wars over in  
3 the future.

1 4 So this plan to add more  
5 uncharacterized waste to inadequately  
6 monitored, unlined trenches, and to fix it in  
7 maybe five years from now, it is not just  
8 immoral and illegal, it is a national security  
9 risk, and even without considering what happens  
10 when a truck full of transuranic waste is  
2 11 intentionally or accidentally breached.

3 12 So I think we've definitely got to  
13 start all over on this EIS. Thank you.

14 MR. DEE WILLIS: Atis  
15 Muehtensachs.

16 **TSE-0024** MR. ATIS MUEHTENSACHS: My name  
1 17 is Atis Muehtensachs, and I think the EIS is  
18 unacceptable, and I am sad that the EPA doesn't  
19 agree with that.

2 20 I think the comment period is too  
21 short, and what does a couple of weeks mean in  
2 22 regards to the thousand year half-lives of the  
23 radionuclides.

3 24 I also think that an Environmental  
25 Impact Statement, I don't know if it is under

81

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TSE-0024 (contd)

3 | 1 the NEPA law, but you should be aware all of  
2 | 2 the federal laws, state laws and local laws  
3 | 3 that are being broken by your actions.

4 | 4 I would like to comment on the light  
5 | 5 pollution, that is very good, something to  
6 | 6 consider.

5 | 7 And in regard to this groundwater  
8 | 8 contamination, I think the word commitment. I  
9 | 9 think that I personally believe that this  
10 | 10 groundwater is more valuable than the plutonium  
11 | 11 that the DOE can produce, and also the salmon  
12 | 12 in the river, is also more valuable than all of  
13 | 13 the plutonium that you have. So. . .

14 | 14 Naturally, my big comment I want to  
15 | 15 reply in your view of this, is I understand it  
16 | 16 is the policy of the DOE to reimburse corporate  
17 | 17 contractors for legal expenses that have been  
18 | 18 obtained by litigation due to environmental or  
19 | 19 health or whistleblower concerns.

6 | 20 And so with this Environmental  
21 | 21 Impact Statement, you will have the lowest  
22 | 22 bidding contractor come, they are going to want  
23 | 23 to cut a lot of corners, and they are going to  
24 | 24 get sued for whatever crimes that they do, and  
25 | 25 when the federal government pays them, I don't

TSE-0024 (contd); TSE-0025

6

1 want the federal government to use taxpayer  
2 money to reimburse their legal fees. That  
3 should come out of the corporation's pockets.  
4 Thank you.

5 MR. DEE WILLIS: Thank you.  
6 Fred Miller.

7 **TSE-0025** MR. FRED MILLER: Thank you.  
8 My name is Fred Miller. I'm a member of the  
9 Board of Directors of Peace Action of  
10 Washington, which is supported by 16,000  
11 households throughout Washington State.

12 And, Tom, when you get the  
13 petitions, we will have people to help gather  
14 those signatures.

15 I won't add to the comments that  
16 have been made on the handling of waste at  
17 Hanford. I will talk a little bit about  
18 economics. Conservative and liberal economists  
19 all say that when you subsidize, you are  
20 subsidizing waste.

21 When the federal government  
22 subsidized irrigation in the west, even the  
23 Reagan administration admitted that more than  
24 65 percent of that water was wasted.

25 The studies that have been put forth

83

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

## TSE-0025 (contd)

1 in peer review journals show it's more like 90  
2 percent of the water is wasted. When you  
3 subsidize legal fees, then you encourage  
4 criminality. Whatever you subsidize, you are  
5 encouraging somebody to go ahead and waste it.

6 And in this case, the federal  
7 government, the Department of Energy is  
8 proposing to subsidize the production of  
9 nuclear garbage.

10 They are saying, go ahead and  
11 produce it, we're going to let somebody else  
12 pay for it, somebody else somewhere down the  
13 road. We are going to minimize not only the  
14 economic cost but the political cost by  
15 shipping it away to some desert someplace in  
16 Washington. A desert in Nevada, which has  
17 remarkably little political clout.

18 So the question is, who's being  
19 subsidized? And it's the nuclear industry,  
20 especially the nuclear weapons production  
21 industry, so that the federal government can  
22 pretend that nuclear weapons are cheap, so that  
23 the federal government can pretend that just a  
24 few billion dollars will give us bunker busters  
25 and mini nukes.

84

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0025 (contd); TSE-0026

1                   The problem is that the few billion  
2                   dollars that they could be spending now, adding  
3                   to the cost of producing those weapons right  
4                   away, will turn into a few trillions of dollars  
5                   when we get around to cleaning it up.

2 | 6                   Actually, I don't think that the way  
7 | 7                   things are going, we will ever get around to  
8 | 8                   cleaning it up. And that the peacocks and the  
9 | 9                   giraffes will be long extinct, and probably  
10 | 10                  human beings will be long extinct, and Hanford  
11 | 11                  will still be producing its toxins.

3 | 12                  And so if the Department of Energy  
13 | 13                  is not going to produce an Environmental Impact  
14 | 14                  Statement that honestly says what the costs of  
15 | 15                  producing that waste are, what the costs of  
16 | 16                  mishandling that waste are, then the people are  
17 | 17                  going to have to do it ourselves, are going to  
18 | 18                  have to take the law into your own hands and  
19 | 19                  use the initiative process to do what Congress  
20 | 20                  has failed to do.

21                  Thank you.

22                  MR. DEE WILLIS: Valerie Rose.

23                  **TSE-0026**   MS. VALERIE ROSE: My name is  
24                  Valerie Rose, and I am a cancer survivor, so  
25                  far I'm a survivor. I am not a downwinder by

## TSE-0026 (contd)

1 birth, though I did work in the fruit ranch  
2 near the Tri-Cities for several years.

3 So my response to any discussion of  
4 radioactive waste and other carcinogens is very  
5 personal.

1 6 The DOE's own model of current and  
7 projected groundwater contamination at Hanford  
8 is a terrifying death sentence predicting  
9 preventable cancer deaths among people and  
10 animals, fish and birds, who will be exposed to  
11 contaminated groundwater for years.

2 12 Lined landfills, groundwater  
13 monitoring and leachate collection are clearly  
14 the minimum necessary to begin to cope with the  
15 existing contamination, let alone any  
16 additional waste. This is where the DOE's  
3 17 focus should be, on dealing with the waste that  
18 is already contaminating Hanford.

4 19 The stop alternative is not a real  
20 alternative. The EIS is an insult. It should  
21 be withdrawn. The DOE must be made to comply  
5 22 with state and federal environmental laws, no  
23 more exemptions.

24 And since the DOE has not yet  
25 adequately contained and cleaned up the

TSE-0026 (contd); TSE-0027

1 existing waste, they should immediately stop  
2 producing more waste. No more nuclear weapons.  
3 No more nuclear energy. Thank you.  
4 MR. DEE WILLIS: Nancy  
5 Kroening.  
6 **TSE-0027** MS. NANCY KROENING: I am  
7 Nancy Kroening from Seattle and Arizona.  
1 | 8 I agree with former speaker, no more  
9 waste at Hanford.  
10 The Draft EIS describes mistakes  
11 that have been made in the past and all the  
12 ways cleanup is being done, it needs to be done  
13 in the future. I believe that the Draft EIS is  
14 just plain inaccurate and disingenuous.  
2 | 15 The numbers of people and animals  
16 that have been harmed over time must be greatly  
17 underestimated. It's like .005 or something  
18 like that.  
19 When I read those statistics, I was  
20 just blown away.  
21 Let me describe how I know that this  
22 just cannot be true. On a beautiful sunny  
23 morning I was swimming with approximately 38  
24 other women in Arizona. We were chatting about  
25 Richland where I had some family members

87

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345



## TSE-0027 (contd)

1 living.

2 One woman from Richland said that  
3 two more people that she knows have turned up  
4 with cancer. I do not think all the truth  
5 about this matter is in this EIS. How do we  
6 get it in there? Reading the DEIS was a real  
7 eye opener. The amount of toxic chemicals is  
8 amazing. And then all the mixes of wastes are  
9 mind boggling.

10 We regularly travel I-5. We are  
11 very unhappy that we are unlikely to be able to  
12 avoid exposure to nuclear waste and transport  
13 in this plan.

5 14 But I didn't see anything in the EIS  
15 about people who were traveling in these  
16 highways and who lived near Hanford and who  
17 would be having increased exposure to nuclear  
18 materials. I simply don't believe the charts  
19 and the numbers.

6 20 The DEIS contains a lot of material,  
21 but for instance, very real problems like  
22 drinking whatever water in the Tri-Cities is  
23 just sort of glossed over.

24 I saw no mention of systems to  
25 filter the water adequately. The health

TSE-0027 (contd)

7

1 effects of company staff were higher than those  
2 of DOE staff. Why?

3 Shouldn't we be doing something  
4 about this and requiring the companies to be  
5 more careful? And have their employees have  
6 less exposure? Admittedly Hanford is a mess.  
7 The DOE has been working on cleanup since about  
8 1995, was when the DOE stopped releasing the  
9 waste en masse into the ground.

10 Why did the DOE wait so long?

11 Now we are being promised liners and  
12 caps maybe on some of the trenches.

8

13 The problems of liners and caps are  
14 legendary and they are discussed in the DEIS.  
15 Water in and around the trenches need to be  
16 collected and treated. We need to clean up  
17 first, prove it is really done, and then that's  
18 enough. No more. Let it be. I am for the  
19 initiative so people can really know what is  
20 happening.

9

21 I agree with the young man who said  
22 the water and the fish are far more valuable  
23 than the nuclear materials.

24 Thank you. Thank you all for being  
25 here.

89

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345

TSE-0027 (contd); TSE-0028

1 MR. DEE WILLIS: Next, Gerry  
2 Pollet.

3 **TSE-0028** MR. GERRY POLLET: Thanks.  
4 What started much of the concern about the  
5 import of waste was a Freedom of Information  
6 Act document we obtained a year ago that said  
7 Hanford will make receiving remote handled  
8 transuranic waste from off-site generators a  
9 priority over award fee work scope. That means  
10 a priority above Hanford cleanup work.

11 Remote handled transuranic waste is  
12 extremely radioactive. As radioactive or more  
13 so than spent nuclear fuel.

14 But it is not shipped in the same  
15 casks as spent nuclear fuel, and they are less  
16 resistant to many different types of  
17 vulnerabilities.

18 They are tested, however, and we do  
19 know that, for instance, a spent nuclear fuel  
20 cask is not designed to withstand a fire of  
21 1,400 degrees for greater than 30 minutes.

22 We also know that shipments of spent  
23 nuclear fuel and remote handled transuranic  
24 waste will go through tunnels and be exposed to  
25 many hazards that will involve fires, potential

90

(541) 276-9491 BRIDGES & ASSOCIATES (800) 358-2345